

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

**Yahya Muquit,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**County of Spartanburg,  
Spartanburg Public Safety Department,  
William Reece, Matthew Dean, Robert Talanges,  
Kenneth Collins, Leslie Smith, Susan Persons,  
Harold Edwards, Doris J. Boozer, Timothy Suber,  
John Burgess, Eric Gallman, John Doe, and Jane Doe,  
in their individual and official capacity,**

Defendants.

**C/A No. 2:06-3334-CMC-RSC**

**ORDER**

Plaintiff filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. All Defendants except Spartanburg County filed a motion for summary judgment on March 27, 2007, and Spartanburg County filed a motion for summary judgment on March 28, 2007. Because Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, he was advised that a failure to respond to Defendants' motions for summary judgment could result in dismissal of his complaint. Plaintiff failed to file a response.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to which

a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report and Recommendation only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

The Magistrate Judge has filed his Report and has recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of his right to file objections to the Report and the serious consequences if no objections were filed. The Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time for doing so has expired.

After reviewing the complaint, the motions, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the action is dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
August 28, 2007

C:\Documents and Settings\Guest\Local Settings\Temp\notesE1EF34\06-3334 Muqit v. County of Spartanburg, et al. dmb - dismiss with prejudice for lack of prosecution.wpd